



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,727	07/31/2001	Stephen Ashcroft	6311-045	4322
21890	7590	09/26/2005	EXAMINER	
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 1585 BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10036-8299			PRIETO, BEATRIZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,727

Applicant(s)

ASHCROFT ET AL.

Examiner

Prieto B.

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/31/01 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Amendment filed 7/12/05, claims 1, 19 and 31 have been amended, claims 1-31 remain pending.

Claim Rejection under 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 19 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this case, claim limitation may have more than one interpretation: (i) wherein the at least one layered content bean is comprises of at least one lower layer and a higher layer, (the layered content bean or the higher layer) that is capable of implementing business logic on the at least one lower layer.

For the purposes of examination [as best understood], the higher layer is capable of implementing business logic, the higher layer being on the lower layer.

Claim Rejection under 103

4. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action.
5. Claims 1-17, 19-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US 6,697,815) in view of Ryan et. al. (US 2002/0130899) (Ryan hereafter)

Regarding claim 1, Wilson teaches substantial features of the invention, including

a “controller” servlet (204) receiving a request for a web page (col 5/lines 7-27) and invoking one of a plurality of handlers (210) associated with said requested web page (col 3/lines 64-col 4/line 12);

said plurality of “handlers” business program (210, col 6/lines 55-55) each performing a processing task associated with one of said plurality of web pages, including processing content required for said requested page (abstract, col 7/lines 55-61);

a handler associated with the one page generating output data "content" required for one web page (content col 8/lines 10-20, col 7/lines 55-67);

populating or storing in an UI model bean (206, col 6/lines 48-49) with said obtained content (col 7/lines 62-col 8/line 35, col 4/lines 13-15);

said controller invokes one of a plurality of "views" JSP (208, col 6/lines 50-52) for presenting said requested web page (col 8/lines 39-42), said view associated with one web page for receiving said content from said model bean (col 9/lines 26-34) and for presenting the one web page (col 8/lines 26-53, col 8/lines 43-44);

a view bean being accessed (invoked) a view associated with one web page for formatting "rendering" the one web page (step 260 of Fig. 2, col 8/lines 43-44); although Wilson teaches that the business processes invoked by the controller retrieve content required from the web page, it does not explicitly teach where the handler invokes a bean for performing this retrieval;

Ryan teaches a data bean for retrieving data from the database [0014, 0106], a data access layer 106h performing data retrieval, said data layer comprising data beans (106f, 106e) [0115].

a combination of presentation beans, data beans, and business related (e.g. advertisement) beans to build pages that are delivered to the consumers, where business logic is incorporated into the beans (abstract). Specifically, a "layered content bean" comprising a first "higher" layer (e.g. a presentation/control layer) and a second "lower" layer (e.g. application/data access layer), wherein the first layer comprises business logic beans for retrieving respective information (e.g. advertisement bean) [0014], the first layer comprising content related beans (e.g. presentation beans 108b) process business logic (rules both presentation and non-presentation or format related) [0130, presentation beans having business logic, see claim 46]. Thereby Ryan teaches a presentation layer that is capable of implementing business logic, where the presentation layer is on top of the application/data access layer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given Wilson teaching for retrieving content for building web pages, Ryan's teachings for building web pages would be readily apparent. Specifically, given Wilson's suggestion for separating program process as an invocable thread of a single daemon process. One would be motivated to combine the references teaches implementing business processes invoking data retrieval beans for retrieving content associated with a request, where business logic may be incorporated into a higher layer comprising the beans to allow the system to select content and

displays based on the consumer, the consumer's product, network, geography, weather, co-brand, language, and locale, as suggested by Ryan (abstract) or the higher layer implementing *business rules that may include a non-presentation related rule* such as displaying wind chill when temperature is less than a certain specified temperature and displaying heat index when the temperature is more than a second temperature, as suggested by Ryan.

Regarding claim 2, said requested web page includes one parameter validated by a handler (Wilson: col 6/lines 3-14)

Regarding claim 3, wherein said request for said requested web page is subsequent to a link invocation "navigation" (Wilson: col 5/lines 7-50 validated by a handler col 5/lines 59-65).

Regarding claims 4, one of said plurality of handlers directs said controller to cause a different web page to be presented (i.e. handler corresponding to requested page Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61).

Regarding claim 5, one of said plurality of handlers directs said controller to invoke a different one of said plurality of views (bean/JSP) for presenting said requested web page (Wilson: col 8/lines 26-33).

Regarding claim 6-8, one of said handlers renders the requested web page (Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61); wherein said controller presents the requested of web page generated (Wilson: step 262 of Fig. 2); wherein each of said plurality of handlers is multithreaded (i.e. multiple programs each comprising a thread Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61, col 3/lines 31-34).

Regarding claim 9, wherein one content bean receives content from a database, see Wilson: col 5/lines 55-59, see Ryan: retrieving data from the database [0014, 0106], a data access layer 106h performing data retrieval, said data layer comprising data beans [0115].

Regarding claim 10, wherein said database system has a first interface requiring an translation to access database via said interface [Ryan: 0014, 0106]

Regarding claim 11, content beans each having a function, which is "layered", i.e. each provide a distinct structure business function logic, [Ryan: 0014, 0130].

Regarding claims 12-13, "configuration file" UI record model bean including a series "list" of data objects for said one web page for inclusion in said at least one of said plurality of web pages (Wilson: col 8/lines 10-16), and wherein said content bean receives said list of data objects to retrieve (Ryan: 0014, 0130), and wherein different pages are generated by modifying the beans (e.g. model bean/JSP) (Wilson: col 9/lines 26-34).

Regarding claim 14, authorization requirements for said requested web page satisfies said authorization requirements (e.g. valid credit card or adequate credit, Wilson: col 7/lines 47-54).

Regarding claim 15, views are multithreaded (i.e. multiple programs each comprising a thread Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61, col 3/lines 31-34).

Regarding claims 16-17, JSP technology views (bean/JSP) for presenting said requested web page (Wilson: col 8/lines 26-33) and view beans formats the one of pages (Wilson: col 8/lines 43-44) into HTML (col 4/lines 19-24, col 6/lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 19, this method claim comprises substantially the same functions discussed on the system claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 20-28, these method claims comprises are substantially the as discussed with respect to system claims 2-4, 9-14, respectively, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 29, rendering includes formatting said requested web page into HTML (Wilson: formatting col 8/lines 43-44 into HTML col 4/lines 19-24, col 6/lines 50-52).

6. Claims 18 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Ryan in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591,272 Williams.

Regarding claims 18 and 30, however the above-mentioned prior art does not teach language translation with respect to the generation of a requested web page.

Williams teaches the use of EJB or bean based scripts associated with business processes for translating content in response to a web page request (col 12/lines 19-30, col 21/lines 9-50 and col 27/lines 54-65).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the suggestion of Wilson for dynamically customized generating web pages in response to user request including invoking at least one view bean for rendering said requested web page, the teachings of Williams would be readily apparent. One would be motivated to include translation files generated to apply foreign language translation to multiple class files “model bean” storing database associated content in response to an HTTP base user request also rendering retrieved content according to the capabilities of ultra-thin client, as suggested by Williams extending Wilson’s

Regarding claim 31, this system claim is substantially the same as claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable, limitation further includes, wherein a “controller” servlet (204) receiving a request for a web page (col 5/lines 7-27) and invoking one of a plurality of handlers (210) associated with said requested web page (col 3/lines 64-col 4/line 12); and said controller nvokes one of a plurality of “views” JSP (208, col 6/lines 50-52) for presenting said requested web page (col 8/lines 39-42), said view associated with one web page for receiving said content from said model bean (col 9/lines 26-34) and for presenting the one web page (col 8/lines 26-53, col 8/lines 43-44).

Citation of Pertinent Art

7. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant’s disclosure. Copies of documents cited will be provided as set forth in MPEP§ 707.05(a):

A. Enterprise Developer, Professional JSP, Wrox Press Ltd., 1999

Disclose a various architect system with JavaServer Pages, Servlets, and JavaBeans supporting dynamic web page generation. Including a dispatcher “controller” for receiving HTTP client request and invoking Java Beans for retrieving content required for a web page (Fig. 1), including a plurality of presentation specific JSPs “views” associated with requested web page for receiving content retrieve from a database and for presenting and rendering the web page, invoked by the controller upon determining the appropriate presentation component, these JSPs only perform presentation and rendering processing/logic. Disclosing a plurality of EJB Java Beans invoked by the invoked by the Servlet or JSPs receiving clients request, these EJB retrieve content for the requested page from external sources, such a database (Fig. 3).

B. Schmidt, Enabling Next-Generation Enterprises, eAI Journal, July/August 2000, p. 75-80.

Schmidt teaches a layered application software structure comprising at least one lower payer and a higher layer that is capable of implementing business logic, the higher layer is on top of the lower layer.

8. Applicant's arguments regarding added claim limitation, indicating that the applied prior art does not teach the newly added limitation has been considered but not found persuasive. In this case,

Ryan teaches least one lower payer and a higher layer that is capable of implementing business logic, the higher layer is on top of the lower layer, as cited above. Schmidt teaches a layered application software structure comprising at least one lower payer and a higher layer that is capable of implementing business logic, the higher layer is on top of the lower layer.

9. Applicant's argument filed 7/12/05 have been fully considered but not found persuasive.

10. Applicant's amendment to all base claims necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Applicant is reminded that when prosecution in an application is closed, an applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a submission and the fee set forth in § 1.17(e) prior to the earliest of: (c) A submission as used in this section includes, but is not limited to, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, or drawings, *new arguments*, or *new evidence in support of patentability*. If reply to an Office action under 35 USC 132 is outstanding, the submission must meet the reply requirements of § 1.111 (see MPEP 706.07)

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3902. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell can be reached at (571) 272-3868. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, status information for published application may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR, for unpublished application Private PAIR only (see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand carried or delivered to:
Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Bldg.
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

Faxed to the Central Fax Office:
(703) 872-9306 (old No. in service until Sept. 15, 2005),
(571) 273-8300 (New Central Fax No.)

Or Telephone:

(703) 306-5631 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

B. Prieto
Primary Examiner
TC 2100
September 21, 2005


BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER